

**REMARKS**

Claims 6-10 and 14 have been canceled. Claims 2-5 and 11-13, and amended claim 1 are in this application.

Claims 1-3 and 11-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,545,709 B2 (Takei et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,720,866 B1 (Sorrrells et al.), U.S. Patent No. 7,315,522 B2 (Wood, Jr.) and further in view of US 2002/0065576 (Beaucour). Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takei in view of Sorrells, Wood, Beaucour and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,408,095 B1 (Maeda et al.) and U.S. Patent No. 6,686,829 B1 (Hohberger et al.). Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takei in view of Sorrells, Wood, Beaucour and further in view of Maeda. Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takei in view of Sorrells, Wood, Beaucour and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,122,329 (Zai et al.).

Independent claim 1 has been amended. As a result, amended independent claim 1 now recites in part the following:

**"in which the wireless communication system is operable to perform in a first mode and a second mode, in which in the first mode the image data along with the confirmation thereof is transmitted and in the second mode one-way transmission of the image data without the confirmation thereof is transmitted,**

in which an average power utilized by the wireless communication system for transmission of the image data and the confirmation thereof is 10 mW (milliwatts) or less, and

in which **an average power** utilized by the wireless communication system **for the one-way**

**transmission of the image data without confirmation thereof is approximately several 10  $\mu$ W (microwatts) or less.**" (Emphasis added.)

It is submitted that the present application provides support for the features herein added to claim 1. With regard thereto and as an example, reference is made to paragraph 0044-0047 and 0065 of the present application.

In explaining the above 103 rejection with regard to claim 1 and as best understood, the Examiner appears to rely on Beaucour (and in particular lines paragraphs 0027, 0057-0058 and Fig. 1 thereof) for disclosing power for communication. (See lines 6-8 of page 7 of the present Office Action.)

In response, it is respectfully submitted that the portions of Beacour relied on by the Examiner do not appear to disclose all of the power features as now specifically recited in claim 1. That is, claim 1 now recites in part the following ". . . in which an average power utilized by the wireless communication system for the one-way transmission of the image data without confirmation thereof is approximately several 10  $\mu$ W (microwatts) or less." (Emphasis added.)

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the above 103 rejection(s) of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-5 and 11-13 are dependent from amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the above 103 rejection(s) of dependent claims 2-5 and 11-13 be withdrawn for at least the reasons previously described.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If,

however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional rejections and/or objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: February 3, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Dennis M. Smid, Esq./

Dennis M. Smid, Esq.

Registration No.: 34,930

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

1331656\_1.doc